

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7 and 13 – 19 are in the application. Claims 1 is currently amended; claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, and 17 – 19 were previously presented; claims 8 – 12 and 20 – 34 are canceled; and claims 3, 4, 15, and 16 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Claims 1 and 13 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slusky U.S. Patent No. 5,487,111. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant notes that claim 1 relates to a system including a first telephone; a plurality of other telephones associated with the first telephone, the first telephone capable of managing separate telephone calls simultaneously conducted by the first telephone and the plurality of other telephones associated with the first telephone; and a computing device coupled to the first telephone, the computing device to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of other telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules and to selectively route telephone call signals of the telephone call received by the first telephone to the first telephone and intended for the second one of the plurality of other telephones and the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules.

Applicant notes that claim 1 clearly states the computing device is (1) to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of other telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules and (2) to selectively route telephone call signals of the

telephone call received by the first telephone to the first telephone and intended for the second one of the plurality of other telephones and the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules. That is, the claimed computing device is to provide both of the claimed aspects (1) and (2). In other words, the computing device is provided to make the determination *the telephone call* received by the first telephone is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules and also to selectively route telephone call signals of *the telephone call* received by the first telephone to the first telephone and intended for the second one of the plurality of other telephones and the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules. Applicant submits that claimed 1 relates to one telephone call that is received by the first telephone. This one particular call is further intended for the second one of the plurality of other telephones.

Therefore, the statement in the Office Action, “[T]herefore, ‘a telephone called received by the first telephone... and intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones...’ may each be intended for a particular phone number” is not agreed with by Applicant. Applicant disagrees with this statement since it is the same claimed telephone call that is received by the first telephone and intended for the second of the plurality of other telephones. Thus, the Office’s reading of the claims to conclude “may each be calls intended for a particular phone number” is mistaken. (emphasis added here) This statement infers more than one call is discussed in the claim.

Applicant also notes that the Office Action states, “[T]he claims do not indicate whether or not the telephone call received by the first telephone was ‘intended’ for that particular telephone or not”. (Office Action, page 6). In reply, Applicant respectfully submits that Slusky fails to disclose the claimed aspect of “a computing device coupled to the first telephone, the computing device to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of other telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules and to selectively route telephone call signals of the telephone call received by the first telephone and intended for the second one of the plurality of other telephones to the first telephone and the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules”.

Applicant reiterates Slusky is directed to routing calls intended for a “called subscriber to be routed to each of a sequence of telephone numbers specified by the subscriber, even though a call placed to one of such telephone numbers is answered”. (See Slusky, Abstract) That is, as specifically disclosed by Slusky at column 5, lines 35 – 62, the Slusky method/system makes a determination that the call intended for the called subscriber has not been answered *by the called subscriber* and continues to route the call according to the subscriber’s specified sequence of additional phone numbers in an effort to reach the intended subscriber. According to the explicit disclosure Slusky, calls are routed to specific phone numbers in a specific sequence as defined by the subscriber’s preferences. Slusky intends to reach a subscriber by calling specific telephone numbers in a specific order or sequence and upon determining the subscriber has not answered to call, proceeds to work through the ordered sequence of phone numbers. (See Slusky, col. 5, lines 35 – 62)

Again, Applicant notes that Slusky explicitly discloses,

From time to time, the subscriber may want to be reached at any one of a sequence of different telephone numbers and, more particularly, at any one of those numbers even though a call placed to another one of those numbers that is earlier in the sequence is answered by someone other than the subscriber. That is, the subscriber is not present at the called location to take the call, but may be present at a location associated with one of the other telephone numbers. To this end and in accord with an aspect of the invention, a mechanism is provided for allowing a call to be routed to a telephone number in the sequence even if the call had been completed, or “answered,” at a previous telephone number in the sequence. (emphasis added) (See Slusky, col. 5, lines 35 – 47)

According to Slusky, each of the calls in Slusky is placed to an intended telephone number in an attempt to reach a particular subscriber. Each placed call is made to a particular phone number as specified by the subscriber.

Thus, it is clear that Slusky fails to disclose the claimed aspect of “the computing device to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones”. There is no disclosure in Slusky of a determination of “a telephone call

received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of telephones” that “is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones”. Each of the calls in Slusky is made to the phone number for which the call is intended (and specified).

Therefore, the necessity to further specifically state that the received call is or is not intended for the first telephone is not seen given the disclosure of Slusky that fails to disclose the claimed aspect of the telephone call received by the first telephone is intended for the second of the other plurality of telephones.

Applicant submits that it is clear that Slusky fails to disclose each and every aspect of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Slusky. Applicant further submits that claim 13 is patentable over Slusky under 35 USC for at least the same reasons provided herein regarding claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 USC 102(b), and the allowance of same.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slusky, in view of Brahm et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,103,167. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant submits that claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively. Inasmuch as claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Slusky as demonstrated above, Applicant submits that the combination of Slusky and Brahm does not render claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 obvious. This is true since Brahm does not correct or otherwise compensate for the failures in disclosure of Slusky.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a), and the allowance of same.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

April 2, 2009
Date

/Randolph P. Calhoun/
Randolph P. Calhoun
Registration No. 45,371
(203) 972-5985

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Customer Number: 28524
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department
Telephone: 732-321-3026